

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are currently pending in the application. Claims 25-26 have been added. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1-5 and 12-14 have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to unpatentable subject matter. Claim 1 as amended clarifies that *at least one server* provides a framework for creating a customized core product to meet a service need specific to the customer that is not met by the core product. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is now more clearly directed to patentable subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-11, at least due to dependency from claim 1, are also directed to patentable subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 of claims 1-11 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,560,633 to Roberts et al. ("Roberts") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,761,309 to Ohashi et al. ("Ohashi"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 is directed to a system for at least one of specializing, replacing, and adding services of a service oriented architecture. Roberts is the primary reference relied upon by the Office Action for the obviousness rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that Roberts does not render obvious independent claim 1, alone or in combination with Ohashi, for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicant respectfully submits that Roberts fails to teach or suggest "a framework for creating a customized core product to meet a service need specific to the customer that is not met by the core product." The Office Action asserts that Roberts' template author web services application (WSA) 602 corresponds to a core product according to claim 1 and that the template author WSA 602 is customized in the teachings of Robert. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Roberts teaches that a user may select features for creation in a template by using a template author application. *Roberts*, Col. 14 ln. 65. According to Roberts, a *template* includes a feature list and a runtime model. *Roberts*, Fig. 2. To select a feature for placement in a template, the user selects a feature from a list of feature types in the template author WSA 602. *Roberts*,

Col. 15. Roberts' system then invokes a web service to generate a user interface to obtain input values for the feature selected by the user from the list of features. Next, Roberts teaches making a web service request so that the template author WSA can build a feature meta data block for the template being created. Roberts discloses invoking a regeneration web service to execute a feature service associated with the feature block for the template. The feature service uses the input values obtained from the user to generate a transformed runtime model. *Roberts*, Col. 15 lns 58-60. Finally, the regeneration web service creates a new web service application based on the features specified in the template.

Applicant respectfully submits that the result of the process cited by the Examiner is a separate web services application and not a customized template author WSA 602, which the Office Action considers to be a core product. Rather, the template author WSA 602 is never customized. The function of the template author WSA is to author a template that can be used to ultimately generate a web services application from a number of pre-existing feature services. Therefore, even if it is assumed for the sake of argument that the WSA 602 corresponds to the claimed core product, Roberts does not teach at least one server providing a framework for creating a customized core product as claimed in claim 1.

Instead of teaching creation of a customized core product as claimed, Applicant respectfully submits that Roberts discloses at most a process for combining services. For example, Roberts states that "WSA's provide a means to enable the web services engine to perform complex tasks involving many web services." *Roberts*, Col. 5 lns. 12-15. Roberts, therefore, attempts to work with various combinations of existing services and uses templates and WSAs to combine the existing services. In contrast, claim 1 requires the untaught feature of "a framework for creating a customized core product to meet a service need specific to the customer that is not met by the core product." Ohashi's disclosure focuses exclusively on security in the context of requesting network services and fails to remedy the noted deficiencies of Roberts. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Roberts and Ohashi.

Applicant respectfully submits that Roberts additionally fails to teach the feature that *the framework creates a customized core product by at least one of: specializing at least one of the plurality of existing service implementations; replacing at least one of the plurality of existing*

service implementations; and adding a new service implementation. As noted above, Roberts discloses selecting features from a feature list, obtaining input values, and eventually generating a web services application based on inputs and existing feature services. Assuming for sake of argument that the feature services can be considered services according to claim 1, as is apparent from presence in a features list, Applicant respectfully submits that all features utilized by the template author application provide preexisting functionality such that no service implementations are specialized or replaced and no new service implementations are added. Instead, in Roberts, existing service implementations are combined and a user interface is generated. Ohashi fails to remedy the deficiencies of Roberts. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 distinguishes over the combination of Roberts and Ohashi. For each of the independent reasons presented above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-11 and 23, in addition to being allowable as dependent on claim 1, are allowable on their own merit. Applicant respectfully submits that each of claims 2-11 recites further novel and non-obvious features relative to creating a customized core product, a feature that, as indicated above, the cited combination of Roberts and Ohashi fail to teach or render obvious. Applicant respectfully submits that, since neither Roberts or Ohashi are pertinent in this regard, the references are similarly inapplicable to claims 2-11 and 23.

For example, since Roberts and Ohashi do not disclose a new custom service implementation, there is no utility or need for the feature that "if the existing service implementation is specialized, a new custom service implementation is created and the existing service implementation is subclassed" as recited in claim 3. By way of further example, where all service implementations utilized are preexisting as in Roberts, there can also be no utility or need for the feature that "a plurality of middleware bindings for the at least one middleware are automatically generate during a build operation" as recited in claim 9. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-11 patentably distinguish over Roberts and Ohashi. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of claims 2-11 and 23 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 12 is directed to a method for at least one of specializing, replacing, and adding services of a service oriented architecture. Dependent claims 13-22 and 24 depend from and further restrict claim 12 in a patentable sense. For reasons similar to those given with

respect to claims 1-11 and 23, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12-22 and 24 are also in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of claims 12-22 and 24 be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 25-26 recite subject matter that is not taught or rendered obvious by the cited combination of Roberts and Ohashi. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 25-26 are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application to be in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Dated: December 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /David A. Lovell/

David A. Lovell

Registration No.: 57,619

WINSTEAD PC

P.O. Box 50784

Dallas, Texas 75201

(214) 745-5400

Attorneys For Applicant